

Status of Claims

Claims 1 and 4 have been rejected under 35USC103(a) for obviousness over Huusko (WO98/37721) in view of Ernan further in view of Rune.

Claim 3 has been rejected under 35USC103(a) for obviousness over Huusko in view of Ernan further in view of Rune and Salminen.

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35USC103(a) for obviousness over Huusko in view of Ernan further in view of Rune further in view of Boudreux.

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 7 are rejected under 35USC112 for failure to point out distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 7 are rejected under 35USC112 for failure to comply with the written description requirement.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35USC101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 7 is canceled, rendering moot the rejections as applied thereto.

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to address the Examiner's 35USC112 rejections in his paragraph 9.

Claim 1 has been amended to require:

"each terminal distinguishes the core network to which it is switched by receiving a location area identifier that includes a core network identifier field and including the core network identifier in its packet transmissions"

This renders moot the Examiner's rejection for lack of post processing solution. Support for this feature is provided by page 12 lines 7 to 10 and lines 15 to 18. Accordingly the Examiner's rejection under 35USC112 in his paragraph 10 is addressed also.

Turning now to the rejection under 35USC103(a), it is respectfully submitted that Rune page 11 lines 38-55 teaches the opposite to the present invention. One reason is as follows:

- (i) Rune states in its column 11 lines 49-55:

“Each of the location area identifiers LAI-A through LAI-C includes an identifier that is unique within the mobile telecommunications network 100. In addition, other identifiers such as network identifiers and country identifiers that make each location area identifier unique on a wider scope may be included.”

(ii) On the one hand, Rune page 11 lines 49-55 refers to a mobile telecommunications network 100 and location area identifiers in which network identifiers may be included that make each location area identifier unique on a wider scope than a single telecommunications network (emphasis added). This makes the location area identifier unique among multiple mobile telecommunications networks 100. As shown in Rune Figure 1 the mobile telecommunications network 100 includes the radio access network.

(iii) Conversely, the network identifier of the present invention included in the location area identifier specifies the particular core network, not mobile telecommunications network, to which a mobile user terminal is connected.

Accordingly, Rune does not teach or suggest

“each terminal distinguishes the core network to which it is switched by receiving a location area identifier that includes a core network identifier field and including the core network identifier in its packet transmissions.”

It follows that amended claim 1 is patentable to the standard of 103(a) over the cited art.

Claim 3

Claim 3 has been amended to address the Examiner’s rejections in his paragraph 9.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 3 is patentable not least on the basis that it depends on an allowable independent claim 1.

Claim 4

Claim 4 has been amended to address the Examiner’s rejection in his paragraph 9.

Claim 4 has been amended to require:

“wherein each mobile user terminal distinguishes the core network to which it is associated by receiving a location area identifier that includes a core network identifier field and including the core network identifier in its packet transmissions”.

This renders moot the Examiner’s rejection for lack of post processing solution.

Support for this feature is provided by page 12 lines 7 to 10 and lines 15 to 18.

Accordingly, the Examiner’s rejection of his paragraph 10 has been addressed also.

As regards the rejection under 35USC103(a), as explained in relation to claim 1 above, Rune does not teach or suggest at least the feature of claim 4 of

“wherein each mobile user terminal distinguishes the core network to which it is associated by receiving a location area identifier that includes a core network identifier field and including the core network identifier in its packet transmissions”.

Amended claim 4 is acceptable under 35USC101. It is respectfully submitted that amended claim 4 satisfies both the “machine” test and the “transformation” test under Bilski. Specifically, claim 4 is tied to particular apparatus and physical structure, namely a core network and a radio access network, as well as mobile user terminals. Claim 4 also involves transformation of an article into a particular state because, for example, the radio access network switches packet transmissions to core networks dependent on their capacity in which the mobile user terminal receives and uses in its packet transmissions a location area identifier including an assigned core network identifier field. The state of the radio access network must be “transformed” each time such a packet transmission switching decision is made.


Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, allowance of all the claims presently in the application is respectfully requested, as is passage to issuance of the application. If the Examiner should feel that the application is not yet in a condition for allowance and that a telephone interview would be useful, he is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at 908 582 7886.

Respectfully submitted

Michael Roberts

Sutha Sivagnanadsundaram

By 
Martin I. Finston
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No.: 31,613
908-582 7886

Date: *25 March 2010*

Docket Administrator (Room 3D 201E)
Alcatel-Lucent USA Inc.
600-700 Mountain Avenue
Murray Hill, New Jersey 07974-0636